



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,327	05/13/2002	Stephane Grellier	09669/012001	5849

22511 7590 04/06/2006

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/030,327	Applicant(s) GRELLIER, STEPHANE	
	Examiner John M. Winter	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 and 11-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

The applicants arguments filed on January 23, 2006 have been fully considered. The pending claims are rejected in view of the reference to Rangachar (US Patent 5,495,521).

See following rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drake (US Patent 6,006,328) in view of Rangachar (US Patent 5,495,521)

As per claim 1,

Drake discloses a method for managing a plurality of commands in a plurality of application files of a microchip card, each command of the plurality of commands in each application file of the plurality of application files being associated with an access condition that a user must meet so that the command is executed. wherein the method comprises the following steps: '

providing a table in the memory of the microchip card for referencing access conditions met by the user to the plurality of commands of the plurality of application files: when a command in one of the plurality of application files has been accessed by the user. referencing the access condition associated with the command as met by the user in the memory table, and when a user orders execution of the command in one of the plurality of application files checking whether the access condition associated with the command is referenced in the memory table. and initiating execution of the command in case the access condition is referenced in the memory table. (Figure 2, column 9, lines 3-35)

Drake discloses the claimed invention except for "a plurality of applications", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 3621

use two applications, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Drake does not specifically disclose said checking and initiating of the execution comprising : making a search to see, when the user has ordered execution of the command in one of the plurality of application files, if access condition corresponding to the command is referenced in memory table, launching the ordered execution of the command if the access condition is referenced asking the user to satisfy the access condition if said condition is not referenced , and then if the user does satisfy the access condition, referencing the access condition and launching the execution of the ordered command. Rangachar ('521) discloses checking and initiating of the execution comprising: making a search to see, when the user has ordered execution of the command in one of the plurality of application files, if access condition corresponding to the command is referenced in memory table, launching the ordered execution of the command if the access condition is referenced asking the user to satisfy the access condition if said condition is not referenced , and then if the user does satisfy the access condition, referencing the access condition and launching the execution of the ordered command

(Abstract, Column 1; lines 47-56) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of licensing at the time the invention was made to combine the Drake method with the Rangachar ('521) method in order to profile attempts of unauthorized usage.

Claim 9 is in parallel with claim 1 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-8, 11- 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John

Art Unit: 3621

Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at (571) 272-6712. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW

April 3, 2006


JAMES R. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600